Application No.: 10/699,323   Docket No.: MWS-089

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-19, 21, 23-30, 32-34, 37-41, 43-45, 48-52 and 54-55 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-19, 21, 23-30, 32-34, 37-41, 43-45, 48-55 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Claims 4, 5, 11, 20, 22, 31, 35, 36, 42, 46, 47 and 53 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicants believe that the pending claims are patentable and in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in view of the comments set forth below.

I. Interview with the Examiner

Applicants thank the Examiner for courtesies extended during the interview on October 17, 2007. During the interview, the cited references and possible amendments to the claims were discussed.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action:

claims 1-34, 37-45 and 48-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,868,526 to Singh (hereinafter "Singh") in view of U.S. Patent 5,990,901 to Lawton, et al. (hereinafter "Lawton"); and

claims 35-36 and 46-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singh in view of Lawton and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,621,880 to Johnson (hereinafter "Johnson").

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. For the ease of discussion, each related claim set is discussed separately below.

A. Claims 1-34, 37-45 and 48-55

1. Claim 1-3, 6-10, 12-19, 21 and 23

Claim 1 recites:

"A method comprising:
receiving an input for selecting a first graphical object in an executable block diagram representing a system, the first graphical object having one or more properties;

12

Application No.: 10/699,323   Docket No.: MWS-089

  displaying a list of one or more transformation operations performable on the first graphical object for transforming the first graphical object into a second graphical object for the executable block diagram;

  receiving an input for selecting one of the one or more transformation operations; and

  applying the selected one of the one or more transformation operations on the first graphical object for creating the second graphical object, the second graphical object having one or more properties that are different from the one or more properties of the first graphical object."

  Lawton and Singh, taken either singly or in any reasonable combination do not disclose or suggest "applying the selected one of the one or more transformation operations on the first graphical object for creating the second graphical object, the second graphical object having one or more properties that are different from the one or more properties of the first graphical object," as recited by amended claim 1.

  In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that Singh does not disclose executing a copy and morph operation (i.e. one of the one or more transformation operations) on the first graphical object to create a second graphical object derived from the first graphical object, wherein the second graphical object automatically has one or more properties that are different than the first graphical object, (Office Action, page 8, ¶ 4). The Examiner cites Lawton to cure the shortcomings of Singh with regard to this claim element.

  Lawton concerns digital images that are not graphical objects in an executable block diagram. Lawton describes a technique that may be used to edit digital images. See Lawton, Abstract. The technique involves selecting an editing effect that is to be applied to a portion of an image, such as a mouth of a picture of a human face. See Lawton, Col. 13, line 63 to Col. 14, line 17 and Figs. 13a-13b. Nowhere does Lawton disclose or suggest a graphical object in an executable block diagram. Thus, Lawton does not disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed "applying the selected one of the one or more transformation operations on the first graphical object for creating the second graphical object, the second graphical object having one or more properties that are different from the one or more properties of the first graphical object," as recited by claim 1.

  Lawton and Singh are not analogous art to each other. That is, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Singh with Lawton as there is no rationale for a reasonable expectation of success. More specifically, one of ordinary skill in the art would

13

Application No.: 10/699,323   Docket No.: MWS-089

not be motivated to combine Lawton's reconfiguration of bitmap images techniques with the graphical objects in an executable block diagram. The modification indicated in Lawton is rearrangement of bitmap image elements. Accordingly, combining Singh with Lawton would not yield the Applicants' claimed second graphical object having one or more properties that are different from the one or more properties of the first graphical object, the first and second objects being objects in an executable block diagram. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Singh with Lawton as there is no rationale for a reasonable expectation of success.

Moreover, contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, Singh does not disclose receiving a user input for selecting a graphical object in the diagram at Figure 3, item 42 and related text, (Office Action, page 2, § 4). A careful review of Figure 3 and its related text in Singh reveals that Singh indicates receiving a selection by a user of a subsystem block corresponding to a graphical class defined in *a library, not an executable block diagram*, (Figure 3, item 42, *See also* Figure 2B and Col. 4, lines 20-26). Likewise, Lawton does not disclose receiving an input for selecting a first graphical object in an executable block diagram. The Applicants, on the other hand, claim *selecting a graphical object in an executable block diagram*, which, as noted above, is not taught by either Singh or Lawton.

For at least the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that Singh and Lawton, taken either alone or in any reasonable combination do not disclose or suggest "applying the selected one of the one or more transformation operations on the first graphical object for creating the second graphical object, the second graphical object having one or more properties that are different from the one or more properties of the first graphical object," and "receiving an input for selecting a first graphical object in an executable block diagram representing a system," as recited by claim 1.

Claims 2-3, 6-10, 12-19, 21 and 23 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate each and every element of claim 1.

In light of the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above rejection of claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-19, 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

14

2. Claims 24-30, 32-34, 50 and 54

Claims 24 and 50 recite similar elements to claim 1. Specifically, claims 24, 50 and 54 recite "executing a copy and morph operation on the first graphical object to create a second graphical object for the block diagram, the second graphical object having one or more properties that are different from the one or more properties of the first graphical object," and "receiving an input for selecting a first graphical object in an executable block diagram representing a system." Claims 25-30, 32-34 depend from claim 24 and, as such, incorporate each and every element of claim 24.

In light of the arguments presented above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Singh and Lawton, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest "executing a copy and morph operation on the first graphical object to create a second graphical object for the block diagram, the second graphical object having one or more properties that are different from the one or more properties of the first graphical object," and "receiving an input for selecting a first graphical object in an executable block diagram representing a system," as recited by claims 24, 50 and 54.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above rejection of claims 24-30, 32-34, 50 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

3. Claims 37-41, 43-45, 51 and 55

Independent claims 37, 51 and 55 recite similar elements to claim 1. Specifically, claims 37, 51 and 55 recite "executing a morph operation on the selected graphical object to create a second graphical object for the block diagram, the second graphical object to change one or more properties of the selected graphical object for the executable block diagram," and "receiving an input for selecting a graphical object in an executable block diagram representing a system." Claims 38-41, 43-45 depend from claim 37 and, as such, incorporate each and every element of claim 37.

In light of the arguments presented above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Singh and Lawton, alone or in any reasonable combination, does not disclose or suggest "executing a morph operation on the selected graphical object to create a second graphical object for the block diagram, the second graphical object to change one or more properties of the selected graphical object for the executable block diagram," and "receiving an

15

Application No.: 10/699,323   Docket No.: MWS-089

input for selecting a graphical object in an executable block diagram representing a system," as recited by 37, 51 and 55.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above rejection of claims 37-41, 43-45, 51 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

4. Claims 48-49 and 52

Independent claims 48 and 52 recite similar elements to claim 1. Specifically, claims 48 and 54 recite "applying the selected one of the one or more transformation operations on the first graphical object for creating the second graphical object, the second graphical object having one or more properties that are different from the one or more properties of the first graphical object," and "receiving an input for selecting a first graphical object in an executable block diagram representing a system." Claim 49 depends from claim 48 and, as such, incorporates each and every element of claim 48.

In light of the arguments presented above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Singh and Lawton, alone or in any reasonable combination, does not disclose or suggest "applying the selected one of the one or more transformation operations on the first graphical object for creating the second graphical object, the second graphical object having one or more properties that are different from the one or more properties of the first graphical object," and "receiving an input for selecting a first graphical object in an executable block diagram representing a system," as recited by claims 48 and 52.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above rejection of claims 48-49 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

B. Claims 35-36 and 46-47

Applicants have canceled claims 35-36 and 46-47. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is moot.

16

Application No.: 10/699,323   Docket No.: MWS-089

CONCLUSION

In view of the above comments, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-089. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: November 19, 2007   Respectfully submitted,

                                            By _____
                                            David R. Burns
                                            Registration No.: 46,590
                                            LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
                                            One Post Office Square
                                            Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
                                            (617) 227-7400
                                            (617) 742-4214 (Fax)
                                            Attorney/Agent For Applicant

17